

Action. The language of the machine translation is so non-idiomatic that it is impossible to draw any firm conclusions about its content<sup>1</sup>. Regardless, Shindo fails to in any way disclose "an error recovery module that determines a status of the automated process and the commands or responses contained therein, based on the generated error recovery information contained in the recovery coupon," as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Shindo, as are claims 4 and 6 for at least the reason that they depend on claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shindo.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 3 depends on claim 1 and is therefore likewise allowable over Shindo for at least the reasons discussed above. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shindo in view of Enta (US 5,983,197). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claims 2 and 8 depend on claim 1 and are therefore allowable over Shindo for at least that reason. Enta fails to remedy the deficiencies in Shindo at least with respect to the features noted above in the discussion of claim 1. Therefore, claims 2 and 8 are further allowable over the combination of Shindo and Enta. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shindo in view of Pugliese et al. (US Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0016825) ("Pugliese"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Along lines discussed above, claim 5 depends on claim 1; Pugliese fails to remedy the deficiencies in Shindo at least with respect to the features noted above in

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, the "Example ¶" contains such sentences as "By doing in this way, Consumer Transaction Facility 2 can know the inclination of failures, such as a lifting and abnormalities in a cone device, as a prior check of maintenance from the information on a file A13," which does not make sense.

the discussion of claim 1. Therefore, claim 5 is allowable over the combination of Shindo and Pugliese. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 9-13 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shindo in view of Kimata (US 5,043,561). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 7 and 9 are allowable over Shindo and Kimata for at least the reason that they depend on claim 1, and therefore by dependency include the feature of "an error recovery module that determines a status of the automated process and the commands or responses contained therein, based on the generated error recovery information contained in the recovery coupon," as recited in claim 1. This disclosure is absent from Shindo as discussed above, and Kimata does not cure the deficiencies in Shindo.


Along similar lines, independent claims 10 and 12 are allowable over Shindo and Kimata for at least the reason that they recite generating error recovery information when an error is detected. The Office Action alleges that this is disclosed in Shindo's "Means for Solving the Problem ¶." However, this feature is absent from the translation. At most, the paragraph only refers to a "failure and event code." This in no way suggests generating error recovery information as recited in claims 10 and 12. Kimata is also silent as to generating recovery information.

In light of the above, claims 7 and 9-13 are allowable over Shindo and Kimata. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claim 1-13 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Pardini  
Registration No. 30,411

William E. Curry  
Registration No. 43,572

TJP:WEC/dxc

Date: September 18, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension Necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--